

GLENWOOD CRESCENT ASSOCIATION

---

*Riverside Owners*  
*"Appeal for Compensation"*

to

A Special Committee of the City Council

(Appointed by Mayor Coulter to give  
consideration to the properties on the  
West side of Glenwood Crescent.)

---

By a Sub-Committee of Home Owners

November, 1950.



8 20 -  
# 24 963

## CONTENTS

	Page
Summary .....	2
SECTION "A"—River Bank Should be Taken over By the City Council .....	3
SECTION "B"—Dike Spoils Beautiful Street .....	5
SECTION "C"—They are People .....	5
SECTION "D"—Riverside Home Owners Must Have Equal Treatment .....	5
SECTION "E"—Government Can Own Houses .....	6
SECTION "F"—The Dike on the Street Has Done the Damage .....	7
SECTION "G"—The 45 Homes are Situated Adversely .....	7
SECTION "H"—Justice For All From All .....	8

---

### Committee: Representing Glenwood Crescent Association

H. Darling	J. G. Fraser
I. J. Dreman	R. J. Johns

## **GLENWOOD CRESCENT ASSOCIATION**

### **River Side Home Owners "Appeal for Compensation" to A Special Committee of the City Council**

#### **SUMMARY**

The detailed sections which follow this summary elucidate the factors which comprise the basic ideas of this appeal. The 45 homes on the river side of the dike located on the former street of Glenwood Crescent are being isolated from standard community conditions. The presence of the dike in front of these homes has created this situation. These houses will constitute the first line of defense should the Red River overflow its banks again as it did in 1950. The dike will resist the spread of the river East and consequently these houses will be in deeper water because of the existence of this man-made dike.

The potential flood threat to these 45 homes has rendered them unsaleable, unprotected by flood insurance, unusable during a flood, and unfavourably located for special dike construction. These factors alone determine that compensation should be paid to these home owners. These 45 home owners are of one mind in concluding that when it was decided to construct the dike in front of these homes, simultaneously with this decision the river side property should have been considered as an integral part of the Dike Project and the properties purchased.

The validity of this claim is tempered with the practice of good human and community relations. While we recognize that this claim constitutes a difficult situation for everyone, we nevertheless think that the remedy can be found in determining and paying fair compensation for this changed status of our homes.

Since the Dominion and Provincial governments are directly involved in locating the dike on the street, it seems to us a reasonable request to make to ask them to participate jointly in helping to provide funds for compensation. In our desire to co-operate fully in seeking a solution, we wish to suggest once again that the river bank should be taken over by the City Council for the creation of a Glenwood Crescent Park. To make this possible we contend that the following would be a practical approach:

- (1) Subdivide the property in Elmwood Park, East of the dike, for residential purposes.
- (2) Transfer houses located on the river side of Glenwood Crescent to the Elmwood Park location.
- (3) Raise and beautify the river bank property and designate this area as Glenwood Crescent Park.

This enterprise should win the approval of all residents in Glenwood Place and Elmwood. In fact, such a step would attract attention and win the admiration of all community spirited citizens. This project would raise the residential status of Glenwood Place and Elmwood. Winnipeg City Council should seek assistance from the senior governments for the suggested project, because it has the inherent qualities of helpfulness, creativity, and progress. To achieve this objective in its entirety, the collective support of the Winnipeg City Council, Provincial and Dominion Governments is, in our opinion indispensable.

### SECTION "A"

Section D. (1) of the brief presented to the City Council on September 22, 1950, provides the basis for Section "A" of the "Appeal for Compensation." It reads as follows:

"If the City Council should have to approve of the plan to erect a Dike on the Glenwood Crescent street, this would be tantamount to taking over all property bounded by the street and the river in this area; therefore on any basis of business management it should purchase the whole property including the houses."

Reasons in support of this argument are numerous—however, the following will throw some light on the validity of this contention.

- (1) The 45 homes have been **isolated** in the interest of the over all diking plan for Winnipeg.
- (2) This **isolation** carries with it a definite lack of flood protection which residents east of the Dike will share and enjoy.
- (3) The Diking Plan determined that the construction had to be done on the street property, therefore automatically separating the 45 homes from the living conditions for which the dike is being constructed.

- (4) Since the street property was chosen for the dike and the 45 houses had to be left without protection, the property and houses on the river side of the dike should become an integral part of the Diking Project.
- (5) The dike is located on the street in the interests of Winnipeg as a whole, consequently the "Moral Rights" reflected in the "Appeal for Compensation" of the 45 home owners evolve from this radically changed community status.
- (6) The 45 home owners know that the presence of the Dike in front of their homes excludes them from the community advantages enjoyed previously.
- (7) The location of the dike in front instead of at the rear of the homes has designated the properties affected as belonging to a doomed area economically.
- (8) The 45 home owners think that they deserve as regular citizens to be treated normally and to enjoy this attention they must be re-established outside of the doomed area which has lost its former residential status by the presence of the dike in front of their homes.
- (9) Before the decision to locate the dike on the street was made, these home owners worked enthusiastically, spending time and capital outlays to restore and even improve living conditions in and around their homes — a significant indication that they were striving for normal living conditions. The presence of the dike in front of their homes has changed this attitude completely.
- (10) Home owners who have had from 25 to 35 years' residential qualifications on the river side of the dike have contributed an endless list of constructive and creative efforts in establishing what was "Glenwood Crescent — the Beautiful Street." This long period of practicing good citizenship habits and attitudes to strengthen and enrich the community must not be forgotten when the "Appeal for Compensation" is being considered.

## **SECTION "B"**

### **DIKE SPOILS BEAUTIFUL STREET**

Glenwood Crescent no longer rates favourably as a beautiful street—the trees are a memory only, the boulevards and sidewalks are absent, the beauty of the winding turns is destroyed, the ornamental lamps are gone, the satisfying feeling created by the combination of beauty and utility can be remembered as "only yesterday it was different." Today we have in the process of development a substitution for the beautiful street of yesterday—a low-grade combination of utility factors from which the dike plan offers no relief.

## **SECTION "C"**

### **THEY ARE PEOPLE**

This "Appeal for Compensation" is being made by a group of citizens whose occupational contributions to the community are extremely diversified—they represent business, industry, craft, semi-skilled, professional, and miscellaneous workers. Their economic status varies almost as greatly as their occupational status. The widow, the retired—sheltered as he thought during the evening of his life, in his own home—the bread winner with meagre earnings, and the small group having more favourable income status, live on the river side of the dike. They are all present and expect from their representatives in public bodies that justice will prevail when the final decision involving their homes is made.

## **SECTION "D"**

### **RIVERSIDE HOME OWNERS MUST HAVE EQUAL TREATMENT**

There are five excellent reasons why river side home owners **must** have equality of citizenship treatment:

- (1) The river side home owners of Glenwood Crescent are carrying full citizenship responsibilities in Winnipeg — no other group of its size can do more.
- (2) Taxes collected from home owners in all parts of the city of Winnipeg are being used to give flood protection to Glenwood Crescent residents on the East side of the dike and by the same token river side home owners must receive appropriate

financial assistance as an integral part of the population of Winnipeg.

- (3) River side home owners are required to make exceptional sacrifices to give flood protection to citizens East of the dike, therefore they should be compensated for this sacrifice.
- (4) The overall Diking Plan determined that the river side home owners had to be left on the wrong side of the dike to secure community protection, but this decision must not deprive 45 home owners from receiving adequate and fair compensation for this sacrifice.
- (5) That property values on the river bank were depreciated after the 1950 flood, some people may argue, but the same could be said about houses on the East side of the Dike. It must be noted however that taxes collected from all citizens are being spent to give dike protection to the latter group which will ultimately improve property values. To administer equal treatment to all citizens, the 45 home owners must receive financial assistance in order to be re-established in homes receiving full community privileges.

## **SECTION "E"**

### **GOVERNMENT CAN OWN HOUSES**

With regard to ownership of property, it has been contended that various types of Governments find it impossible to own property. Let us cite the case of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation which is a Crown Company set up, owned, operated and controlled by the Dominion Government for the purpose of facilitating mortgages and in some cases titles to property under what was formerly known as the National Housing Act.

If a Corporation of this kind can be set up for real estate in one sphere, it is logical to assume that another Corporation or Branch of the present one could be set up to purchase all of the homes behind the dike by owning and renting these homes, the same as is done with Wartime Housing and more recently with Peace time Housing. This Corporation could in time liquidate what at the outset would look like a permanent outlay of a substantial amount of money.



The advantage of this set up would be that the present owners would be reimbursed for the entire value of their homes and many would no doubt elect to become tenants; if not, other tenants could quite easily be found and over a period of time the amount paid out by the Government would eventually be liquidated. At that time they could continue the proposition as a permanent investment or could have the homes removed and the riverside permanently beautified.

## **SECTION "F"**

### **THE DIKE ON THE STREET HAS DONE THE DAMAGE**

Whatever may be said to the contrary, the presence of the dike on the former street of Glenwood Crescent has done the permanent damage to the 45 homes. The 1950 flood came and is gone. Its memory is being perpetuated by the presence of the dike in its present location. Another spring without a flood and people would, under normal conditions, once more regain confidence in the district. To those of us who have lived there 25 years or more, the dike in front of our homes constitutes the real enemy. We are told the long term diking plan will, in five years, correct the flood danger. But this reform will not benefit the river side homes because the dike has already created a new environment in the district. No longer can a first-class residential area be a reality—it is a memory only. The dike on its present location has done the real damage to the property values, and to the home life of the people affected. Anyone trying to estimate the damage done should come face to face with the stark fact that by one stroke of authority the life savings of many home owners have been completely destroyed—fair compensation is the only way to solve this community problem.

## **SECTION "G"**

### **THE 45 HOMES ARE SITUATED ADVERSELY**

In another flood situation the following four points will be operative:

- (1) Home owners will be without flood insurance
- (2) Household belongings will have to be put in storage.
- (3) Home owners will be compelled to seek shelter on the other side of the dike.
- (4) The houses will be damaged by water and more water will rise to higher levels in the homes than would be the case if the dike was not constructed.

The question that arises immediately from the contents of this section of our "Appeal for Compensation" is,— "Is it good citizenship practice to ask these home owners to carry this financial responsibility?"

## **SECTION "H"**

### **Justice For All From All**

Section E. 3 — "Justice for All" which was read carefully to Mayor Coulter and members of the Council on September 22nd, is included herewith because of its appropriateness to satisfy in part at least our "Appeal for Compensation" — Section E. 3 reads:

"If the final decision, although objectionable to us, should locate the Dike on the street of Glenwood Crescent, less than justice will be done to the home owners, if compensation is not based on complete replacement value of their houses—the "Homes" as such, if disturbed by the presence of the Dike, can never be replaced with any sum of money—the houses can be, but the residents who participated in creating their homes, paying for the street, street lamps and boulevards, etc., are sure that in the event of being compelled to adjust themselves to the new situation, will be making, in the interests of Winnipeg as a whole, enough sacrifices without having to be subjected to any financial embarrassment. Therefore compensation must be determined by the formula of complete replacement value of the houses affected.

This "Appeal" is characterized by the factor of Human Relations. Justice for all from all is not too expensive. In fact, in all our discussions, as numerous as they have been, one paramount thought has emerged — it is one of great concern lest the final decision dealing with our present predicament could not be defended everywhere. Winnipeg during and since the 1950 flood has occupied the attention of citizens near and far. In reaching a decision regarding the disposition of the 45 homes isolated on the wrong side of the dike on Glenwood Crescent, it is our sincere hope that the City Council will be quoted near and far as having completed a difficult task with dignity, efficiency and fair play. This means that justice must prevail for all from all.



